

To: Dunbar, Bill[dunbar.bill@epa.gov]
From: Wright, Garth
Sent: Wed 3/23/2016 11:45:11 PM
Subject: Fw: Draft Administrator briefing ready for internal review
Puget Sound Briefing for 1-26-15 House Ag Hearing (1-7-15).docx

FYI - in the final version they removed the legal justifications for Q3.

From: Chang, Lisa
Sent: Thursday, January 7, 2016 3:41 PM
To: Wright, Garth
Subject: FW: Draft Administrator briefing ready for internal review

My apologies, Garth – left you off inadvertently.

From: Chang, Lisa
Sent: Thursday, January 07, 2016 3:40 PM
To: Schuster, Cindy <Schuster.Cindy@epa.gov>
Cc: Opalski, Dan <Opalski.Dan@epa.gov>; Murchie, Peter <Murchie.Peter@epa.gov>; Edmondson, Lucy <Edmondson.Lucy@epa.gov>; Bill Zachmann <zachmann.bill@epa.gov>; Michael Rylko <Rylko.Michael@epa.gov>; Holsman, Marianne <Holsman.Marianne@epa.gov>
Subject: Draft Administrator briefing ready for internal review
Importance: High

Hi all,

Here is a draft Puget Sound briefing for the Administrator that can be run through the R10 review process. Sorry this is getting to you so late in the day, Cindy – I am cc-ing Marianne here too, in case this is too late for you to move it forward before leaving today. Here is a quick summary of how I addressed major comments – commenter name followed by my response below:

- 1) Joel Beauvais – move some of the framing information to be more up front in the document. Discussed this with Cindy – we were told to follow a common format for these briefings, Key Messages/Background/Possible Q&A. To address Joel's comment, I changed the title to help frame the briefing but didn't change the basic structure.
- 2) Lucy – remove background bullet on WA CAFO permit and Whatsupstream because separate briefing paper was provided on former and latter covered in Q&A. Lucy – I tried to

shorten these a lot but retained them and referred to the separate briefing and the later Q&A. I thought a quick summation as background might be helpful. Does the new version work?

3) Joel Beauvais – too detailed and long. I consolidated information in the “key messages” section and trimmed throughout, but it could still use some editing down, particularly Q&A #3 on Whatsupstream.com. Cindy and I discussed this a bit, though, and feel that it is important to include a reasonable amount of detail in the latter portions of the paper so it is there in case questions come up.

So here you are, Cindy and Marianne, please let me know what else you need.

Lisa